

#: 493441 SO/Outbox File
11-May-93 8:01:00
Sb: David Lifton
Fm: MAIL [forwarded msg]
To: Mary Ferrell 76450,706

Dear Mary,

People are entitled to their sincerely held beliefs on the subject of President Kennedy's assassination. Nevertheless, when a prominent writer about the assassination dares to suggest, as David Lifton now does, that the Warren Commission and its various counsel were as honest and objective in their account of the evidence as newspaper reporters attempting to simply report news, I believe it is not only fair but urgent that those who are all too familiar with the record question that writer's bona fides as a critic, as well as the true nature of the role that he appears to perform in this controversy.

I am now completely comfortable in saying that David Lifton is not one of those of us who have been seeking the truth about the assassination. His personal agenda is clearly quite the opposite: to distort and/or obscure the facts; to defame and/or denigrate those (such as Bob Groden, Cyril Wecht, Sylvia Meagher, and others) who have devoted their lives to this quest; to heap ridicule upon the critics; and to mislead the unsuspecting and the susceptible in a manner that distracts both the general public and less experienced researchers from the central issues and evidentiary problems in the case.

Lifton, who obviously not only tape records his telephone conversations but maintains detailed records on his contacts with the critics (from his point of view), has so seriously distorted, and in some instances actually falsified the history of our limited dealings with each other, that my initial reaction to the garbage he has disseminated within the past few days is not so much one of shock, but of a very sad, final confirmation of the deep suspicion in which I have held him for many years: There is a deep vein of dishonesty in this man and in his work on the case that bespeaks a foul purpose and intent.

This man could not have survived, living independently in a Los Angeles apartment (no matter how humble his abode may have been), and running up gigantic travel, telephone and document reproduction bills for a period of some 15+ years prior to the publication of his book, without the kind of financial assistance that bespeaks something much more than occasional gifts from his parents. He had no visible means of support. Aside from whatever he was paid for the Ramparts article, and for consulting on "Executive Action", he does not appear to have had any other visible source of income. He seems not to have had any kind of a job during that period. I have no way of knowing exactly how David Lifton kept himself going during those years

Who is David Lifton? David Wrone wrote a critique of his book suggesting that it was "a black book", i.e., CIA-inspired. I don't know whether David is CIA, but he is almost certainly some kind of a disinformation operator. Whoever he really is, he is simply not one of us. During the first major wave of controversy in the mid-1960s, he advanced the wild hypothesis of

paper mache trees camouflaging the assassins on the grassy knoll. In immediate wake of the HSCA investigation, he came forward with his theory of body-snatching and body alteration by some mysterious boogiemen. His book helped to destroy whatever momentum we had back in 1980-81 to keep the case alive back then, and it made the critics look like basket cases! When Oliver Stone was putting his movie together, Lifton was desperate to find a berth on the train. When he couldn't, he "shook down" Stone for \$50,000 in "quiet money" without making any contribution to the film. Now, as we approach the 30th anniversary, he exonerates the Warren Commission (having already done the same with the autopsy pathologists).

Can there be any doubt that Sylvia's distrust of David, and her fear and contempt for his close association with Liebler, were fully justified?

This man and his work must be discredited and denounced for the fraud that they are, otherwise we are going to have a very serious problem should we succeed in lobbying for even a "mini-investigation". If history is a viable measure for prediction, the government will seize upon the "Best Evidence" theory as representative of so-called scholarship and criticism in the case, they will knock it down with a feather, and we will have lost perhaps the final opportunity in our lifetimes to learn the truth.

Love,

Roger (forwarded message follows)

--- Forwarded Message ---

#: 82051 S8/Conspiracy Theories [POLITICS]
10-May-93 23:58:44
Sb: The loose cannon fires
Fm: Roger Bruce Feinman 75530,3540
To: All

During the past several days, I've received a number of telephone calls from people around the country (apparently a carefully selected few, of whom I was not one) who had just received from David Lifton hard copies of his two essays that have now been posted in the library here. I have just downloaded those essays and very briefly skimmed them to get the gist and style of Lifton's comments.

As Mr. Lifton has been prone to do on other occasions involving other critics whom he apparently perceives as threats, he has personalized the debate over "Best Evidence". It is immediately obvious that Sylvia Meagher, who had the capacity to "cut down to size" those who fell short of her expectations, must have hurt David Lifton terribly (his pretense at dealing with the events surrounding her death and her papers, about which he knows next-to-nothing, is particularly offensive to me for its untruthfulness).

In my case he has issued an account of our dealings that is replete with factual errors, distortions, wild assumptions and innuendo, hardly hesitating to drag into the picture the memory of a very tragic young man, Greg Stone, about whose life and death, including his relationship with Sylvia Meagher, David Lifton also knows next-to-nothing.

A clear indication of the intent of Lifton's latest tome is that, although he was not invited to dinner with Oliver Stone in Chicago (it was on Thursday night, not Friday as he states in his essay), he inaccurately describes my behavior toward Stone, matters he could not possibly have first-hand knowledge of, since he was not there. As soon as we were introduced, I looked Stone in the eye and told him that I was the man responsible for seeing to it that he did not get the rights to use Sylvia Meagher's book or her name in his film. After that, we had a very pleasant dinner conversation.

My inclination is to take the same amount of time that David Lifton has taken in formulating a detailed "sur-rebuttal" (something like two weeks). I think that is a particularly wise approach, because I do not want to mimic Lifton's shrillness. But I would like to know what the sense of the forum members is: Are you interested? Are there any points in particular that you wish to see discussed? Are there any questions that you would like me to answer? I will monitor for reaction and post my response in due course.

-roger-